

**WASHINGTON STATE BOUNDARY REVIEW BOARD  
FOR KING COUNTY**

**REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

**November 13, 2003**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Jim Denton convened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

**II. ROLL CALL**

Van Anderson	Lloyd Baker
Chuck Booth	A. J. Culver
Ethel Hanis	Claudia Hirschey
Roger Loschen	Judy Tessandore

**III. MINUTES**

Regular Meeting: Chair Denton presented the minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 22, 2003 for review and action by the Board members.

Action: *Lloyd Baker moved and A.J. Culver seconded the motion to adopt the minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 22, 2003. The Board voted (eight in favor) to approve this record. Ethel Hanis abstained, as she did not attend the October 2003 Regular Meeting.*

**IV. ADMINISTRATION**

**A. Chair's Report**

General Business

Chair Denton reported that the Board has been active in the following matters, including: (1) King County Council review of the Boundary Review Board 2004 Budget Proposal; (2) nomination of officers for 2004; (3) reclassification of Reginald Holmes; (4) work with the State Association to finalize legislative program guidelines; and (5) pre-development review for future Notices of Intention. Committee members and staff will report on each of these activities.

Resignation of Julie Davidson:

Chair Denton reported, with regret, the resignation of Julie Davidson from the Board, effective December 31, 2003. A letter of appreciation for her service has been sent to Julie and the Board will be honoring her services with a plaque.

Mrs. Blauman is working with Office of the Governor to appoint a new member so that there will be complete representation on the Boundary Review Board in 2004.

WSBRB Association – 2004:

Roger Loschen reported that the State Association is now functioning under the leadership of Rob Nebergall (Spokane County). Mr. Nebergall is working with representatives of the Executive Board to plan a comprehensive, economical program for 2004. The program will include a new legislative services system. The Association is also endeavoring to provide enhanced training and education events, including a single combined Educational Workshop/Annual Conference supplemented by periodic regional seminars.

Mr. Loschen will provide updates on Association planning and activity schedules.

## B. Committee Reports

### Budget Committee:

*County Council - 2004 Budget Review:* A. J. Culver and Lenora Blauman reported on the King County Council review process for General Fund Budgets, including the funding for the Boundary Review Board.

On October 22<sup>nd</sup> the Council Budget Development Panel began a comprehensive review of the proposed General Fund Budget. That document included the Boundary Review Board budget. At that time, the Council raised no issues with respect to the proposed funding for the Board.

On October 28<sup>th</sup> the Council reviewed the Executive's Budget Advisory Task Force Report (BATF) with special attention to the Task Force recommendations for encouraging annexations in order to reduce County costs for services to unincorporated areas. The Council asked numerous questions concerning the feasibility of implementation of the Task Force recommendations. For example:

- The BATF Report proposes that annexation of unincorporated urban areas to cities will benefit the County because the County will then no longer have responsibility for serving these urban areas. Thus the County will no longer be providing an "urban subsidy." Several Council members debated the definition – or questioned the existence – of an urban subsidy.

Council members stated that a single definition of "urban subsidy" must be provided and the concept must be verified as accurate or eliminated from consideration as a factor affecting the fiscal viability of the County.

- The BATF Report calls for the hiring of new staff to work with local communities to encourage annexations. However, over the past six years, more than 38% of the citizens of unincorporated areas have affiliated with cities. That is a brisk rate of affiliation. Therefore, question was raised as to the justification for spending more money to undertake an activity which is occurring successfully with existing staff support services.
- Incentive funding to support annexations is proposed by the BATF Report, with funds proposed to come from such sources as CIP monies. What is the benefit to cities from the County removing CIP funds for, as an example, road improvements and then giving those funds to the city which would be then required to use the funding to accomplish those precise road improvements? Are there other types of incentives (such as direct provision by the County of local parks, roads, etc.) that would be more appealing to cities and to citizens of unincorporated areas?
- In the absence of specific criteria for distribution of incentive funding, how can equitable distribution be ensured? How will such limited incentive funding actually serve cities? If some cities have more complex issues and come later to the table, will funding be retained for those cities?

(*Note:* Some Council members stated an intent to withhold approval of incentive funds until criteria are established for funding distribution.)

- How will elimination of unincorporated areas benefit (or result in costs to) the County?

For example, DDES relies entirely upon funding from unincorporated areas for evaluation and permitting of development in those areas. As unincorporated areas diminish, DDES will have less funding to complete its work – how will the County provide funding to DDES?

Further questions were raised at a Council Budget Panel planning retreat on November 1<sup>st</sup> and November 2<sup>nd</sup>. At that retreat, some Council members reportedly raised concerns about

the manner in which cities were proposing (and/or failing to propose) annexations in a timely manner. Questions were raised about the role of the Boundary Review Board in review of applications. For example, there were concerns that the Board might be negatively impacting the County and the cities by permitting too many small actions, allowing “cherry picking”, and prohibiting some actions that would transfer unincorporated lands to local jurisdictions.

Council staff was assigned to prepare an Issue Paper addressing the role and responsibilities of the Boundary Review Board in addressing transition of unincorporated areas to local jurisdictions. That Issue Paper was presented to the Council Budget Committee on November 4. The Issue Paper addressed:

- The Annexation Process
- Annexations to King County
- Concerns About Annexation Patterns
- Boundary Review Board Role and Authority
- Conclusions (Options and Alternatives to the Boundary Review Board)

Mrs. Blauman reported that the Issue Paper included several errors – both of omission and commission. The misinformation caused considerable confusion among Council members with respect to the annexation process in general and also with respect to the specific authorities and responsibilities of the Boundary Review Board.

Council members expressed the opinion that the Boundary Review Board should be actively promoting/seeking annexation applications, encouraging a rapid timetable for annexations, and approving larger annexations – preferably only entire PAAs -- in order to reduce the County’s responsibilities for governing and serving unincorporated areas.

Similarly, Council members appear to fail to recognize that RCW 36.93 criteria require the Board to concern itself primarily with the ability of the local jurisdiction to govern and serve its citizens. Consideration of County fiscal constraints and service limitations is germane in the context of the Board’s review of an application, but County resources would be a significant factor only in exceptional circumstances – such as in matters of public health and safety.

Council expressed interest in disbanding the Boundary Review Board as the agency responsible for review of annexations and other actions. Questions were raised as to alternative means for the administration of applications to create or change jurisdictional boundaries.

To address Council concerns, the Boundary Review Board staff was required to provide for the Council a Statistical Report (2000 – 2003) listing each Notice of Intention, including the proposing jurisdiction, acreage, zoning, and other detailed information. The Office of the Executive also requested similar information on current Boundary Review Board activities.

Board staff also provided to the Council and the Executive with a “Response to Council Staff Issue Paper” (RCSIP), a narrative report, to provide complete and correct information to the Council concerning the role and responsibilities of our agency.

For example, the RCSIP informed Council that in 2002 – 2003, applications for smaller and moderate sized annexations have occurred as a direct response to limitations placed upon jurisdictions by the Supreme Court decision of March 2002. With this decision, the Court prohibited the most frequently utilized petition method annexations. The RCSIP also reported that, with new legislation, the Board expects an increasing number of applications. The RCSIP noted that, based upon the preliminary information provided to the Board by various jurisdictions, it appears that moderate and larger annexations likely will increase in number and will be more complex in scope.

The RCSIP” also addressed the extensive Pre-Application Services that the Board provides to local jurisdictions. The Pre-Application Service provides information and encourages (as

ethically appropriate) proposed actions that are consistent with both State law and with King County policies.

The RCSIP addressed the fact that Boundary Review Board decisions must be based upon the provisions of RCW 36.70A (State Growth Management Act); RCW 36.93 (Enabling Act); the King County Comprehensive Plan; and numerous other state, regional and local regulatory authorities. The Board's document included discussion of the fact that the agency is required to address guidelines which promote local governance, establish land use patterns, ensure availability of public services and facilities to preserve public health and welfare, and consider the availability of sufficient fiscal resources to provide for governance of an area.

The RCSIP reported that the Board has encountered only one instance of potential "cherry picking" since 1999. Specifically, in 2000 the City of Renton applied to annex the 63-acre commercial Merlino properties. Those properties were included in a 78-acre Potential Annexation Area (PAA.) The City's proposal excluded the remaining 14-acre residential area that was a part of the PAA.

In that instance, the County invoked jurisdiction based upon concerns that the City was "cherry picking." The Boundary Review Board, following the legal standards for review of annexations, made a decision to require Renton to annex the entire 78-acre PAA. The Renton Merlino application is the only recent instance in which a jurisdiction has proposed to take in a major commercial area while excluding residential property in an established PAA.

The Boundary Review Board report stated that, at this time, the Board has identified only one jurisdiction that may have a future interest in annexing commercial land exclusively. County staff is working with that jurisdiction to encourage annexation of the complete Potential Annexation Area. If that jurisdiction persists in "cherry picking", the Council retains the right to invoke jurisdiction so that the Board can evaluate such application and make a decision to approve, modify or deny the application.

With respect to Council's concern that the Board is insufficiently attendant to fiscal issues, the RCSIP provided the example of the City of Redmond NE Rose Hill Annexation (2000). Note was made of the fact that the City of Redmond proposed a 74-acre annexation in the 111-acre NE Rose Hills PAA. Jurisdiction was invoked by a community group which requested that the Board to deny the annexation in order to permit citizens to continue to live in unincorporated King County. King County officials requested that the Board to expand the annexation to provide for local governance for the entire 111-acre area, because the County possessed insufficient funds to provide public facilities and services to the area. The Board, following the legal standards for review of annexations, made a decision to require Redmond to annex the entire 111-acre Rose Hills PAA.

Additionally, the RCSIP addressed the Council's opinion that the County could immediately disband the Boundary Review Board. The RCSIP reiterated the 2001 Prosecuting Attorney Office Opinion stating that the Board must continue in place, pursuant to RCW 36.93.230, until local jurisdictions have completed comprehensive planning and development guidelines. The PAO also spoke to the role of the Boundary Review Board in providing discrete, independent review services for communities seeking to create or change jurisdictional boundaries.

In the event that Council were to obtain a new opinion from the PAO indicating that the Board could be disbanded, then the County Council would be required to provide review of applications for annexations, mergers, assumptions, extensions and transfers of service, and for incorporations. In that situation, the Council would be subject to the requirements of RCW 36.70A and RCW 36.93.

The RCSIP stated that the King County Council – if it assumes the role of the Board – will lose a significant tool for guiding the annexation process. More specifically, the Council cannot both review applications and invoke jurisdiction in response to proposals for action. If the Council were to be constituted as the body to review annexations and similar actions,

then the County must depend upon citizens or local jurisdictions to invoke jurisdiction necessary to conduct a public hearing to enable the modification or denial of an application. The Council will no longer have the authority to invoke jurisdiction to create the basis for a public hearing.

Finally, the RCSIP noted that the Board currently provides Council with substantial information on Boundary Review Board authorities and activities. An Annual Report and Quarterly Status Statement reporting on Boundary Review Board actions are also provided to Council and the Executive. Further, the Board provides Council members with documents for each application for annexation or other changes to boundaries proposed for his/her district and for immediately adjacent districts.

Further, the RCSIP stated that "...the Board invites and welcomes Council member review and comment upon applications, reports, and other materials. Note was made of the fact that the Board would be pleased to schedule additional presentations to the full Council (or individual Council members) at any time." Mrs. Blauman stated that she has, in fact, begun the process of scheduling a presentation by the Board to Council.

Further, Council and the Executive were informed that the Boundary Review Board conducts regular Orientation Programs for Board members in order to acquaint the Board members with the regulatory authorities that guide our agency. The RCSIP reported that a key objective of the Orientation Program is the provision of information to the Board concerning King County priorities, issues, and interests. Council and the Executive were invited to provide representatives to present information to the Board in conjunction with this Orientation Program.

Mrs. Blauman concluded the RCSIP with the statement that "the Boundary Review Board is privileged to serve King County, the County's local jurisdictions, and community members. The Board looks forward to continuing to work with County officials to provide for the transition of unincorporated territories to local communities."

Mrs. Blauman stated that the Office of the Executive utilized the "Response to Issue Paper" in discussions with Council and the material was presented, in part, at a November 12, 2003 Council Budget Panel Meeting.

At the November 12<sup>th</sup> Council Budget Panel Meeting, Council members reported preliminary support for funding the Board through 2004. The Panel Members stated, however, that the Council's 2004 Work Program would include review of the role and responsibilities of the Boundary Review Board. Specifically, the Council will:

- Seek greater involvement in the current Boundary Review Board process "to ensure that negative fiscal impacts are considered by the Board." This might be accomplished by invoking jurisdiction.
- Evaluate opportunities for changes in state law to require pre-annexation agreements between the county and a city prior to annexation of an area.
- Evaluate opportunities for changes in state law to "reorganize the Board as part of the legislative branch."

Council review of the individual components of the General Fund Budget will continue through November. The Council proposes to adopt a final 2004 budget prior to the Thanksgiving Holiday. Work Program design is also underway. Implementation of the Work Program would begin in 2004.

Chair Denton invited comment by Board members. Comments included the following statements:

- The Council must be thoroughly informed of the authorities – and the limitations – that guide the Boundary Review Board. For example, the Boundary Review Board must emphasize that citizens (and the jurisdictions proposing to govern those community members) must propose annexations. The Board cannot solicit annexations.

- The fact that the Board is required to address several criteria in review of an action (RCW 36.93, RCW 36.70A) should be made clear to Council. For example, the Board must consider social and economic factors in conjunction with an annexation. More specifically, under RCW 36.93, the Board is required to consider whether an annexing jurisdiction can provide services to new residents. But RCW 36.93 does not set as a criterion funding constraints which may limit the ability of the County to serve an area. These constraints can generally be considered only in limited circumstances -- such as situations in which there is a risk to public health and welfare.
- Note was made of the fact that -- although it is important to provide information to Council -- those Board representatives communicating with Council Members should ensure that their statements relate the services that the Board can provide and the guidelines under which the Board functions. There was discussion concerning the propriety of communications that provide information about the Board as contrasted to the impropriety of per se lobbying for preservation of the Board. Guidelines for providing information should ideally be established well in advance of the Council budget review process.
- Based upon the relatively small number of actions before the Board at this time, there was a suggestion that the Board consider working with County officials to promote annexations. Such activities could increase the value of the Board to the County.

Work with the public to increase community interest -- and input into -- the process of transition to local governance should be supported as a priority of the County and the Boundary Review Board.

In discussion, it was reported that the Board does seek to provide information to collegially with King County, the Cities of King County, and community groups to address creation of or changes to jurisdictional boundaries. However, Board members and staff are limited in their authority to promote -- or oppose -- proposals for annexations and other actions. As prescribed by RCW 36.93, the Board must maintain its independent, quasi-judicial status in order to review applications for all actions related to jurisdictional boundaries.

Mrs. Blauman reported that she is seeking a date early in 2004 for the Board to make a presentation to the County Council concerning the role and responsibilities -- including the authorities and constraints -- that guide the Boundary Review Board. A brief summary of Boundary Review Board regulatory authorities, activities, and future work program will be included in that material.

To address County service priorities, Mrs. Blauman reported that the Board staff will continue to work with County representatives and community members to provide general guidance and information concerning annexation, mergers, and other actions. The Board staff will continue to provide pre-application services to jurisdictions proposing to create or change boundaries. In all activities, the Board staff will continue to address State of Washington requirements -- provided under RCW 36.93 -- which mandate that the Board function as an "independent, quasi-judicial" agency.

*Boundary Review Board 2004 Budget Management:* Lenora Blauman reported that staff is in the process of preparing a year end review of the Board's budget allocations for 2003. For 2003 -- as for 2001 and 2002 -- the "Travel and Subsistence" line is the most heavily subscribed budget line. The "Travel and Subsistence" line supports:

- Local travel by Board members and staff to Regular Meetings, Special Meetings, and Committee Meetings;
- Local travel by Board members and staff to WSBRB Association conferences, workshops and meetings;
- Local travel by Board members and staff to the State Legislature;

- Local travel to education and training programs (American Planning Association, Law Seminars International, etc.).

This line also supports Mrs. Blauman's travel to the Annual National American Planning Association Conference for education and training.

Each year the Board staff develops a Work Program that estimates the number of meetings and other professional activities requiring participation by Board members and/or staff. In years when the number of activities and/or level of participation by Board and staff members are consistent with the work program predictions, the Travel and Subsistence line is sufficient to provide payment for these activities. In years when the number of activities and/or level of participation by Board and staff members exceed the Work Program predictions, travel expenditures periodically exhaust the funds allocated to the Travel and Subsistence line. Excess charges have been limited, so that it has been possible to meet travel and subsistence expenditures by transfer of funds from other lines in which a surplus exists.

At this time, as the Board plans for specific Boundary Review Board Budget lines for 2004 and subsequent years, Mrs. Blauman stated that Board members may wish to review policies and management of travel and subsistence expenses. This task is generally undertaken biannually – customarily by the Budget Committee and/or the Steering Committee.

Chair Denton requested comment on this matter. Board members requested a detailed reporting of allocation and utilization of the "Travel and Subsistence" line, including both expenditures for confirmed activities (e.g., the Board Regular Meetings) and estimates for expected activities (e.g., visits to the State Legislature, Association meetings, APA training programs).

Mrs. Blauman will provide the requested fiscal data to the Board at the December 2003 Regular Meeting. At that time, the Board will develop a plan for the Steering Committee (in consultation with the Budget Committee) to review the "Travel and Subsistence" line.

Legislative Committee: Legislative Committee Chair Lloyd Baker and Roger Loschen have been working with the Washington State Boundary Review Board Association Executive Board to create Legislative Consultant Guidelines for that organization. Major items of interest include qualifications for the Consultant and the responsibilities of the person working with the Legislature on behalf of the Association.

Mr. Loschen reported that the Association Executive Board met on November 13<sup>th</sup> to consider these matters. The Executive Board made a decision to establish a new "pilot" plan for providing information and services to the Legislature in 2004. Specifically:

- The Association will work directly with the Legislature in 2004 – with services provided by Association members. The Association will not employ a Legislative Consultant in 2004
- Susan Winchell (Spokane County) will monitor bills introduced to the Legislature. Information will be obtained both directly from the Offices of the Legislature and from the American Planning Association Legislative Team. Lenora Blauman will assist Ms. Winchell in this activity.
- Bills of potential interest to the Association will be submitted to the Association's Legislative Committee. The Association Chair (Rob Nebergall) and Roger Loschen will co-chair the Legislative Committee.
- The Legislative Committee will review these bills and provide a position paper (as necessary) to address pending legislation. The Legislative Committee will also assign an Association member to meet with appropriate legislators and attend meetings of the Legislature concerning such pending legislation.
- The Association will evaluate this pilot project at the conclusion of Legislature 2004.

During the coming year, the Association will continue its efforts to develop Legislative Consultant Guidelines – with the plan that these guidelines would be useful to either continue the in-house service to the Legislature or to employ a Legislative Consultant for future years.

For 2004, the Association will fund legislative services by payment to Spokane County and by reimbursement for expenses to Association members traveling to Olympia to meet with the Legislature.

Robert Kaufman, Special Assistant Attorney General, was requested to present a report on Use of Public Funds for Legislative Activities. Mr. Kaufman provided a written legal opinion and a report stating that various state laws (and case law) indicate that compensation may be provided to Board members visiting the Legislature on behalf of the King County Board and on behalf of the State Association.

Personnel Committee: Judy Tessandore, Chair, reported that the Personnel Committee has met to complete the annual Performance Evaluation for Lenora Blauman. She requested an Executive Session to review the Performance Evaluation with the Board.

*Action: Judy Tessandore moved and Chuck Booth seconded the motion for the Board to enter into a 12 minute Executive Session to review Lenora Blauman's Performance Evaluation with the Board. The Board unanimously agreed to enter into Executive Session from 8:10 p.m. – 8:22 p.m.*

The Board resumed the Regular Meeting at 8:22 p.m. Ms. Tessandore recommended that Mrs. Blauman continue as the Executive Secretary for the Boundary Review Board. The Committee also recommends that the Board recognize Mrs. Blauman's service to the Board through the granting of a merit increase for 2004.

*Action: Judy Tessandore moved and Chuck Booth seconded the motion that the Board adopt the Performance Evaluation for Mrs. Blauman. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote.*

Mrs. Tessandore also reported that the Personnel Committee is working with Mrs. Blauman and Mr. Holmes to complete the application for reclassification of Mr. Holmes from Administrative Staff Assistant to Administrator II. The application will be submitted to King County Human Resources in January 2004.

Nominating Committee: Roger Loschen, Chair, reported that the Nominating Committee is required to select a slate of nominees for Board Chair and Vice- Chair (Chair Elect) for 2004. Mr. Loschen reported that the Nominating Committee is recommending Jim Denton as Chair for and Judy Tessandore as Vice-Chair.



Chair Denton invited other nominations to serve in each of these offices. No other nominations were offered.

*Action: Chuck Booth moved and Ethel Hanis seconded the motion that the Board select Jim Denton as Chair of the Boundary Review Board for the 2004 term of office. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote.*

*Action: Chuck Booth moved and Ethel Hanis seconded the motion that the Board select Judy Tessandore as Vice-Chair of the Boundary Review Board for the 2004 term of office. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote.*

Steering Committee: Ethel Hanis, Acting Chair, reported that the Steering Committee is working with Mrs. Blauman to provide a minor revision to the Notice of Intention Form for annexations, assumptions, mergers and similar actions. In brief, the Board will request that applicants provide Advance Courtesy Notification of a pending Notice of Intention. This notification is intended to permit the Board staff and Board members to plan more efficiently for reviewing files, and in order to timely inform stakeholders (e.g., government officials, community groups) of a pending Notice of Intention. This Advance Courtesy Notification package would include the following materials:

1. A Letter of Intent to propose an action (e.g., annexation, assumption, merger). The letter should provide a brief description of the proposed action.
2. A preliminary Legal Description
3. A preliminary site Map/Vicinity Map

For those jurisdictions that have voluntarily provided this information, the Board has been more successful in serving the applicant and interested citizens.

Chair Denton invited Board members to comment on the proposed revision to the Notice of Intention. There was discussion as to whether this proposed Advance Courtesy Notification should be made a requirement. Staff recommends that a request – rather than a requirement – be established for the Advance Courtesy Notification for a preliminary testing period. In most cases, the jurisdictions are pleased to provide that information that will streamline the review process for applications. However, in some circumstances, a jurisdiction may find it difficult to provide such advance notification.

In the event that the request for information does not result in substantial compliance, the Board has the authority to further revise the guidelines for Notices of Intention to require Advance Courtesy Notification.

*Action: Ethel Hanis moved and Van Anderson seconded a motion to approve revisions to the Notice of Intention to request that applicants provide advance courtesy notice of pending applications to the Boundary Review Board. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.*

### **C. EXECUTIVE SECRETARY'S REPORT**

Boundary Review Board Office Space: Mrs. Blauman reported that Tim Clancy of King County Facilities Management has informed her that the interim relocation of the Board offices is imminent. Facilities Management has identified some options for temporary relocation to the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of the Yesler Building. The Hearing Examiner and County's Risk Management Offices will be the prime tenants on that floor. Board staff will be touring this space on November 14. To date, no specific schedule for interim relocation has been provided to the Board.

Mr. Clancy reports that, as the County's Seismic Project winds up late next year, Facilities Management should be able to identify a more permanent home for the Board. It is possible that the Board could become a candidate for the new building, due for completion in 2007.

American Planning Association National Conference: Mrs. Blauman reported that the American Planning Association National Meeting is slated for Washington D.C. in April 2004. She requested that the Board consider whether to send a representative to that meeting.

Board members suggested that a decision to send Mrs. Blauman to the APA Conference should await completion of a planned review of the Board's budget for "Travel and Subsistence." A decision would be made in January 2004.

Mrs. Blauman reported that if the Board wishes her to attend the Conference, but finds that funding is insufficient to reimburse all expenses, she would be pleased to personally fund a portion of expenses for this event.

Growth Management in Washington – Law Seminars International: Mrs. Blauman reported that she will be attending a conference on Growth Management in Washington. The meetings will be held in Seattle on November 17-18. The conference agenda includes information on a variety of issues related to growth management – e.g., New Legislative Developments; Annexations; Local Government Non-Regulatory Tools for Growth Management; GMA Hearings Boards Update. At the December Regular Board Meeting, Mrs. Blauman will report to the Board on the conference.

Finance Management: Mrs. Blauman reported that she and Mr. Holmes attended a King County Finance Managers' Meeting to discuss the following issues:

1. Financial Management Section Realignment
2. Fiscal Year End Process and Schedule
3. State Auditor's Reports and Management Letter
4. Fraud Reporting
5. Cash Receipting and Handling Policies and Procedures
6. Grant Financial Administration and Reporting - Year End Memo
7. Questions/Other Issues

In brief, the State Auditor gave general approval to the County's financial management systems. The Auditor's Report did not specifically address the Boundary Review Board. However, the Report did recommend that each department develop specific financial management policies and procedures.

Mrs. Blauman reported that the Boundary Review Board does have basic financial management systems in place. Staff will review the Board policies and procedures in keeping with the Auditor's guidelines. If revisions are required to our financial management systems, Board staff will work with the Budget Committee and the Steering Committee to update those documents.

Annual Growth Report: Mrs. Blauman reported that King County has issued its 2003 King County Annual Growth Report. It will be available to Board members in January 2004.

2004 Orientation Program: The Board will be provided with an Orientation Program early in 2004. The Annual Growth Report will be presented. The County Office of Management and Budget and DDES will also participate in this Orientation Program. Council representatives may also be invited to serve as educators for the Orientation Program.

#### **D. Correspondence**

Correspondence was reviewed briefly. No questions or issues were raised with respect to the substance of the correspondence.

## **V. NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. Notices of Intention**

File No. 2157 – City of Redmond Rose Hills Phase I Annexation: Mrs. Blauman reported that the City of Redmond proposed a Notice of Intention to annex a portion of the NE Rose Hills Potential Annexation Area. The Notice of Intention was lacking several required items, including a document from the King County Auditor's office certifying the authenticity of the petitions for annexation. As the annexation boundary and the boundaries of the area from which signatures were gathered were not consistent, the Auditor's office could not authenticate the petition. Therefore, the City of Redmond has withdrawn that application pending resolution of this matter.

Board members did not offer questions or comments on the substance of the file.

File No. 2158 – City of Bellevue Tax Lots (Cougar Ridge) Annexation: Mrs. Blauman presented a summary of the application. This is an island annexation which the City of Bellevue could have managed through an internal administrative review process. The City elected to bring the action to the Boundary Review Board to provide a forum for public review. Board members did not offer questions or comments on the substance of the file.

### **B. Pending Files**

- |                    |                         |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| - Auburn           | - Covington             |
| - Kent             | - Ronald Sewer District |
| - Woodinville      | - Kirkland              |
| - Federal Way      | - Redmond               |
| - Renton (8 files) | - Snoqualmie            |
| - Tukwila          |                         |

## **VI. Adjournment**

*Action: Ethel Hanis moved and Judy Tessandore seconded a motion to adjourn the Boundary Review Board Regular Meeting. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.*